



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS.

ELEMENTS OF LAW. By Sir William Markby, K.C.I.E., D.C.L. Fourth edition. Oxford, 1889. 8vo. Pages xii. and 443.

The merits of this excellent book have been so generally recognized that the reviewer can hardly do more than point out an occasional slip or misapprehension. The learned author's discussion of fraud, duress, and error is in general a model of clearness and accuracy. But his criticism on pages 247 and 359 of *Cundy v. Lindsay*, 3 App. Cas. 459, seems unfounded. The shipment of goods to B. in pursuance of an order in the name of B., but really emanating from A. without B.'s knowledge, surely cannot pass the title to either A. or B. Dr. Markby apparently fails to discriminate between such a case and a sale to A., who, being personally present, pretends to be B. In the latter case the title passes to A., for the vendor did mean to sell to the individual before him although under a misapprehension as to his name.¹ Our author must also have overlooked *Ex parte Adamson*, 8 Ch. Div. 819, and *Houldsworth v. Glasgow Bank*, 5 App. Cas. 331, 338, when he expressed his regret, p. 142, that the convenient word "restitution" had not found a place in accepted English terminology. A printer's error on page 400 puts the Statute of Uses in the reign of Henry VII.

Apart from the acknowledged excellence of this book the appearance of a fourth edition is highly gratifying to all who have at heart the interests of legal education. The marked success of the "Elements of Law," like the similar success of Professor Holland's "Elements of Jurisprudence," shows that the value of the scientific study of law is rapidly gaining recognition even in England. We wish we could add that there was an equal advance there of the belief that the science of law, like any other science, may be best pursued at a university under the guidance of men who make the teaching of law their profession. But university publications like the book before us must hasten the day when English lawyers will recognize, as continental and American lawyers already recognize, the superiority of the law department of a university over all other places of legal education.

J. B. A.

VOID EXECUTION, JUDICIAL AND PROBATE SALES. By A. C. Freeman. Third edition. Central Law Journal Company, St. Louis, 1890. 8vo. Pages 178.

An extended notice of the plan and scope of this work is unnecessary, for, as the publication of a third edition shows, the book is already well known. It may be divided into three parts: the first explains what will render a sale void; the second, the rights of purchasers at void sales; and the third is devoted to an interesting and careful discussion of the constitutionality of the many curative statutes and of those authorizing involuntary sales in the absence of any judicial proceeding whatever. The book covers the subject fully and merits the success which

¹ See accordingly *Edmunds v. Merchants' Co.*, 135 Mass. 283; *Robertson v. Coleman*, 141 Mass. 231.